

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 25 to 30. These sheets replace the original sheets including original Figures 25 to 30.

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 1, 2009, Applicant requests Examiner's reconsideration based on the amendments herein and at least the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance.

In the amendments, claim 42 has been amended and claims 42-44 are pending in the present application. In the replacement sheets of drawings, a legend of X-Y axis has been added to Figs. 25 to 30 as described in the original specification. No new matter has been added in the amendments.

Rejections On Claims 42-43

Claims 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KR 1998-0066632 (hereinafter, "the '632 reference") in view of Moriguchi et al. (US Patent No. 5,736,017; hereinafter, "Moriguchi"). The Examiner has stated in the rejection that the '632 reference teaches all the elements of the claimed invention except for a rectangular opening and strip liners made of plated conductive material, which the Examiner has stated is taught by Moriguchi.

In order for an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the

invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). See MPEP 2143.

Applicant has amended claim 42 to include, *inter alia*, horizontal strip bars which are “respectively” coupled with right and left edges of a first platinum plated mesh along an X-axis direction while being spaced apart from each other; and vertical strip bars which are “respectively” coupled with top and bottom edges of a second platinum plated mesh along a Y-axis direction while being spaced apart from each other. *[emphasis added]*

In other words, the claimed invention as amended above includes the horizontal strip bars each of which is “respectively” coupled with the right and left edges of the first mesh, and the vertical strip bars each of which is also “respectively” coupled with the top and bottom edges of the second mesh. The strip bars of the claimed invention are each coupled with the edges of the mesh respectively.

In contrast, the ‘632 reference discloses a wire reeled through the grooves (see Fig. 1b, 6 and 7 of the ‘632 reference) of a frame. In the ‘632 reference, one wire is wound around the grooves of the frame. Such structure of the ‘632 reference is the one that the claimed invention is designed to overcome its disadvantages such as in case that the “one” wire is damaged, the entire apparatus would be inoperable. In contrast, since the claimed invention has a plurality of strip bars which are “respectively” coupled with edges of the mesh, the apparatus is able to operate in case that a strip bar is damaged.

As for Moriguchi, there is no disclosure or teaching in the reference of anything about the horizontal and vertical strip bars as claimed in claim 42.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither the '632 reference nor Moriguchi, either alone or in combination, teaches the horizontal and vertical strip bars as claimed in the amended claim 42.

Accordingly, claim 42 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious over the '632 reference in view of Moriguchi. Claim 43 is depending from claim 42, and thus includes all the limitations of claim 42. Accordingly, claim 43 is also believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious over the '632 reference in view of Moriguchi.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections on claims 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejections On Claim 44

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '632 reference in view of Abrahamson et al. (US Patent No. 4,923,582; hereinafter, "Abrahamson").

Claim 44 is depending from claim 42 and thus includes all the limitations of claim 42. As discussed above, the '632 reference does not disclose nor teaches the horizontal and vertical strip bars as claimed in the amended claim 42.

Abrahamson also does not disclose or teach the horizontal and vertical strip bars as claimed in the amended claim 42.

Accordingly, claim 44 including all the limitations of claim 42, is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious over the '632 reference in view of Abrahamson.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection on claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this amendment or otherwise regarding the present application in order to address any questions or remaining issues concerning the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 1, 2009

By: /Jae Y. Park/
Jae Y. PARK
Registration No. 62,629
Customer No. 82727

Kile, Goekjian, Reed & McManus, PLLC
1200 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Suite 570
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-8000
Facsimile: (202) 659-8822